



Seattle
Design
Commission

APPROVED
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
6 June 2002

Gregory J. Nickels,
Mayor

Donald Royse
Chair

Tom Bykonen

Ralph Cipriani

Jack Mackie

Cary Moon

Iain M. Robertson

David Spiker

Sharon E. Sutton

Tory Laughlin Taylor

John Rahaim,
Executive Director

Layne Cubell,
Commission Coordinator

Projects Reviewed

Yesler Community Center and
Low Income Housing Project
Oxbow Park
Roxhill Park, Phase II
Zymogenetics

Convened: 8:30am

Adjourned: 5:00pm

Commissioners Present

Donald Royse, Chair
Jack Mackie, Vice Chair
Tom Bykonen
Ralph Cipriani
Cary Moon
Iain M. Robertson
David Spiker
Sharon E. Sutton

Staff Present

John Rahaim
Layne Cubell
Brad Gassman
Sally MacGregor



Department of Design,
Construction & Land Use

700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104-5070
phone 206/233-7911
fax 206/386-4039

6 Jun 2002 Project: **Meeting with Mayor Nickels**

Attendees: Mayor Gregory J. Nickels
Marty Curry, Seattle Planning Commission
Diane Sugimura, Department of Design, Construction and Land Use

Time: .75 hour

The Commission met with Mayor Nickels to discuss the Mayor's priorities, the Commission's current work, and how the Commission could best provide assistance. The Commission and Mayor identified some specific priority projects, including the Viaduct, the waterfront, Light Rail, the Monorail, South Lake Union, existing park and library levies, High Point, and the nature of street and alley vacation reviews. The Mayor specifically asked for the Commission's input on SR519 and the next phase of the Civic Center project. The Commission and the Mayor agreed that current decisions about major projects, especially the large transportation projects, will affect the city far into the future, and agreed that it was important to take advantage of the opportunities represented by these projects to re-connect the City and revitalize neighborhoods. The Commission recommended ongoing support for CityDesign, recognizing the valuable urban design framework and important background knowledge that it provides the Commission and other City departments, and in helping to relate individual projects to larger City plans and goals.

6 Jun 2002 Project: Yesler Community Center and Low Income Housing Project**Phase:** Pre-Design**Presenters:** Toby Ressler, Department of Parks and Recreation

Richard Franko, Mithun

Ellen Kissman, Seattle Housing Authority

Roger Williams, Mithun

Attendees: Merv Gorasht, Design Review Board Member

Heather Hargeshemmer, Mithun

Scott Kemp, Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use

John W. Marshall, Department of Parks and Recreation

Tom Rooks, Mithun

Robert Scully, CityDesign

Time: 1.25 hour

(SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00275)

Action: The Commission appreciates the presentation and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Commission commends the design team for the thorough site analysis;
- looks forward to the development of this project as a catalyst for future redevelopment within the neighborhood;
- challenges the team to avoid an inward looking scheme and seize upon this site as an opportunity to make better connections between this community and the larger city, especially downtown and First Hill;
- supports the design team's recognition of this site as an important part of the City's Blue Ring/ Open Space Strategy, particularly the views and potential open space at the intersection of Yesler Way and Broadway Avenue, which should not be used for auto drop-off;
- encourages the team to develop a massing concept and parking layout that will maximize public use of the site;
- **points out a discrepancy between the sustainable design analysis with the urban design analysis;**
- **looks forward to the development of the social spaces and different types of open spaces, and encourages the team to use clear diagrams to explain the character of and connection between these social spaces; and**
- **approves pre-design work on the project.**

The design team for the Yesler Community Center and Low Income Housing project presented the project's program goals, design principles, and siting issues for this unique joint venture between Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) and the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks Department). The project will be funded by the Community Center Levy and Seattle Housing Authority. The current community center is the smallest in the city, and is only a 4,700 square foot gym. The project includes a new full service Yesler Community Center of 20,000 square feet, including a basketball gym, activity space, and multi-purpose space. The project will also include replacement of the twenty-one low-income rental housing units that must be removed for the construction of the community center, the Yesler Terrace property management office, and auxiliary facilities. As a mixed-use building with multi-family housing, the Design Review Board will also review this project. The current Yesler Terrace public housing

community offers about 580 units on fifty acres.

As the Community Center levy was being developed, the City approached SHA to donate a site to accommodate a new community center at Yesler Terrace. Once the levy passed, an initial siting study, to determine an appropriate location for the community center examined five potential sites in various locations around Yesler Terrace, all of which were found to be unacceptable by either the Parks Department, SHA, or both. A second site study focused on the area along Yesler Way, between Eighth Avenue and Tenth Avenue. This study included several meetings with Yesler Terrace residents. The preferred location identified through this study includes the location of the existing community center, and extends east to Tenth Avenue South.

Project Program:

Community Center:

- Lobby/ Reception
- Administrative Offices
- Full size gymnasium with storage
- Activity Spaces
 - Multi-purpose room with adjacent kitchen
 - Arts and Crafts Room
 - Fitness
 - Game Room
 - Teen Room
 - School-Age child care associated outdoor play area
 - Computer/ Library

Parking

Housing

- Management offices for Yesler Terrace
- Shared Laundry facility
- 28 housing units: mix of 1 and 2 bedroom
- Parking

The design team explained the project goals for the project, which address the project's relationship with the larger Seattle community, as well as the project's relationship with the Yesler neighborhood. The project will also be sustainable, and the design team hopes to attain a LEED™ Silver rating for sustainable design and construction.

Within the Seattle context, the project will enhance open space connections by creating a vista down the "Broadway Corridor," making connections to the CityDesign's Blue Ring pedestrian system. The project will also highlight the activity of the community center, by bringing life to the outdoors, and making interior activities visible on the street edge. The gym would probably be located along



Yesler Way, while other active spaces would be located along the open vista to the south.

The project is a significant opportunity to enhance the spirit of the Yesler neighborhood by creating a “Heart of the Community” that nurtures pride, interaction, and a unique identity for the local residents. The views from the site will be optimized, and the open view throughout the site will also serve to ensure a safe and secure site. The design team will also work with the community to select an artist early in the design process, to provide optimal integration with building design and community goals.

As the design team strives to attain a LEED™ Silver rating, they will design with the sun, wind, rain, and significant existing trees to optimize building locations. The building design will be optimized for heating, daylighting, and power production. This energy efficiency will also be supported by enhanced natural ventilation. The design team also plans to reduce the amount of rainwater draining from the site. The site slopes away to the south, and orientation of the site supports many of these goals. Seventy-five parking spaces are required at the site, but the design team hopes that the extent of impervious surface on the site is not great; the design team is exploring options.

Merv Gorasht, a Design Review Board member updated the Commission Yesler Community Center and Housing project review the previous day. The Design Review Board believes that this is a terrific civic project, and recognizes the potential for more open space and a cohesive neighborhood project. The site is a “precious site” on a plateau. This site and this community need a “front door.” There will not be parking access along Yesler Way, and the Design Review Board supports this idea. Gorasht also explained that the design team may propose a building setback of five feet, rather than a typical fifteen feet; the building will be approximately thirty feet tall, and this height, at this setback, must be addressed by the design.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know the zoning of the site.
 - Proponents stated that the site is zoned L3-30, which has a height limit of thirty feet. The height of the gym would be mitigated by transitions and setbacks to the community center.
- Would like to know why the community center is one level.
 - Proponents stated that the community center is one level for security purposes.
- Would like to know if the project would include improvements to the existing open spaces on the site.
 - Proponents stated that there may not be enough money to make these improvements.
- Commends the design team for the overall site plan. Recognizes that public housing is typically isolated. Believes that there should be strong connections between this community and downtown.
- Recognizes that one of the design principles indicates a need to retain the active social spaces within the neighborhood. Encourages the team to present diagrams showing the social spaces within the community, and then present diagrams showing how the new social spaces at the community center would coordinate with the existing spaces in the community. Urges the team to present a diagram of the proposed five foot setback, and how this setback would relate to existing social spaces in the neighborhood.
 - Proponents stated that the open space to the south, the ball field, would likely be redeveloped as housing in the future. Further stated that there is also an existing path and public stairway that connects Yesler Terrace and the International District.

- Encourages the team to consider how the project would serve other uses within the community, or how this project would not inhibit other uses in the area.
 - Proponents agreed that this would be an important stage of the design process.
- Would like to know how the central area, between the community center and the housing, would be used. Would like to know if this would be parking. Does not believe that this project should be inward-looking. Urges the design team to show how the open spaces would be public spaces for the community.
 - Proponents explained that this space was for parking. Proponents stated that housing could be built atop the community center, increasing the height of the building, but would also increase the amount of open space on the site.
- Would like to know if the team has considered underground parking.
 - Proponents stated that underground parking would require a high level of security, and would be expensive, but underground parking is not out of the question. Further stated that the five foot setback would also allow the team to increase the open space south of the building, at which the views are important.
- Encourages the design team to begin to work with a landscape architect now, so that the interaction between the inside and outside spaces is seamless.
- **Would like to see site diagrams explaining pedestrian and vehicular movement, in order to better see a connection between this site and the larger Seattle area.**
- Believes that the overall site strategy, the placement of the community center and housing, is appropriate. Is excited that the Open Space Strategy has been incorporated in the concept design. Recognizes that the design team will continue to address these ideas throughout the design process, but believes that the general site strategy is good.
- Commends the team for the extensive site analysis, and recognizes that the team has raised a number of issues. Encourages the team to look at the open spaces on the site with the same level of coherence as the diagrams that address the building design.

Key Visitor Comments and Concerns

- Merv Gorasht, representative of the Design Review Board, believes that the Commission raised numerous interesting issues and concerns. Believes that the open space and the gym would be the most permanent strategies on the site. Recognizes that the site is tight for the program and required level of parking. Believes that eleven units per acre is actually low density. Does not believe that the long term future of the site should be compromised.

6 June 2002 Commission Business

ACTION ITEMS

A. TIMESHEETS

B. MINUTES FROM 2 MAY AND 16 MAY 2002- APPROVED

DISCUSSION ITEMS

C. VIADUCT AND MONORAIL UPDATES- RAHAIM/ CUBELL

D. DR REPORT AND ACTION PLAN- GASSMAN

ANNOUNCEMENTS

E. THE BLUE RING PRESENTATION- 6/25, 5:30-7:30PM, BENAROYA
HALL

6 Jun 2002 Project: **Oxbow Park (6400 Corson Avenue, Hat n Boots)**

Phase: Design Development

Previous Review: 6 September 2001 (Schematic Design Briefing)

Presenters: Nate Cormier, Jones and Jones, Architects and Landscape Architects
Steven Wright, Department of Parks and Recreation

Attendees: Kevin Carl, Jones and Jones, Architects and Landscape Architects
Shaney Clemmons, Jones and Jones, Architects and Landscape Architects
John Leonard, Department of Neighborhoods
Michael Shiosaki, Department of Parks and Recreation

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00246)

Action: The Commission commends the team for the presentation and update on this small, but brilliant project. The Commission would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Commission congratulates the team for securing early funding, and believes that funding is more assured with exemplary projects such as this;
- believes that reopening a restroom within the boots would be appropriate for the site and historically accurate, but recognizes that this may not be feasible in meeting current code;
- urges the design team to increase the distance between the “Hat and Boots” elements given their grand scale, and avoid placing a tree between the “Hat and Boots” as shown on the plans, but rather let the icons stand on their own;
- encourages the design team to reconsider the selection of trees at the southwest corner;
- encourages the design team to make minor improvements to the path and low walls at the west entrance;
- believes that the west entrance should be framed by symmetrically-placed trees;
- approves design development of this project, complimenting all of the departments and teams involved, and noting the extensive community involvement; and
- believes that this will be an incredible neighborhood park.

The design team presented the design for Oxbow Park, which has changed since the previous Commission review. While the general design concept and scheme is the same, some grading and drainage, vegetation, utilities, site furniture and the children’s play area have changed. To respond to previous Commission concerns, the scheme has also been simplified, and the design elements on the site have been integrated.

Drainage

There will be a landform, a continuous ridge, along the south end of the park to provide an enclosure to the Hat and Boots amphitheater. This will drain to a curtain drain at the central area of the amphitheater, which will be planted with turf grass. Other surfaces throughout the park will drain to the garden terraces. Seattle Public Utilities has completed soil analysis, and the drainage system throughout the park

will not be connected to the sewer for the runoff overflow.

Vegetation

Evergreen trees will frame the northwest corner of the park. The community is also raising funds to purchase shrubs for these edges. Columnar tulip poplars will be planted around the edge of the amphitheater, to provide a sense of enclosure to this area. Poplars will also be used to frame the entrance at Corson Avenue. A fruit tree orchard will be located between the Hat and Boots and the garden terraces. Some of the existing trees within the park are not in good shape, but the apple tree will remain as long as possible.

Utilities

Because of the planting, there will be two conditions of maintenance within the park. Irrigation will be required in the turf grass, but not in the low mow meadow. Temporary watering will also be required, to expedite the new tree growth. There will be a water line for the drinking fountain. While restrooms will no longer be located in the boots, an electricity storage box will be in the boots, for special events. Electric up lighting will also be provided for the Hat and Boots stage. The team has considered including a self contained composting toilet to the north of the garden terraces at a future date.

Site Furniture

Site furniture is not a part of Phase I. The design team had planned to use recycled glass for the concrete aggregate; recycled concrete will be used. The “bones” of the site will provide places to sit, and will be the infrastructure of the park. These “bones” would link the park and the site back to the cardinal directions. There will no longer be a climbing play structure at the southeast edge of the park, but play opportunities will be provided throughout the park. The play structure may be located just west of the P-Patch.

Phase I of Hat and Boots was not part of the Pro Parks levy, but the community secured a Neighborhood Matching Fund grant; most of Phase I would be funded by this grant. A structural foundation will be provided for the Hat and Boots, but the relocation schedule, funding and events will be separate from the park’s Phase I construction. Interpretive displays, etched panels, will also be incorporated in the base and structure of the hat, as the hat will be raised.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Supports reconstruction of the bathroom within the boots. Recognizes that this would be historically correct.
 - Proponents stated that an ADA accessible restroom within the boots would not fit.
- Does not support the tree planted between the hat and the boots. Feels that these elements should be visually linked, without a tree.
- Believes that originally, the hat and boots were located further apart. Would like to know if they could be separated. Recognizes that these are such large objects, and they need space to ensure their presence is appropriate.
 - Proponents stated that they have discussed this with the community. Further stated that the boots could move to the east, but the design allows significant green space within the children’s area.
- Recognizes that poplars typically require very moist soils. Is concerned that the soil would be too dry.
 - Proponents stated that there are other poplars throughout Georgetown that have been thriving.

- Would like to know why the bones do not continue across the paths, especially through the path at the west entrance.
 - Proponents stated that these design changes due to budget constraints, and a desire to simplify the budget. The furniture bones have been retained, but the suggestive bones through the parks have been removed from the design.
- Believes that the bones should continue across the paths to continue to define the spaces. Would like to know the materials of the path. Feels that the path should continue to the edges of the bones.
 - Proponents stated that the path would be decomposed granite.
- Commends the team for the strong design. Believes that the design team has addressed the Commission's previous concerns and comments.
- Believes that all of the elements of the park are complementary and well-defined, while each element maintains the themes of the park.

6 Jun 2002 Project: Roxhill Park, Phase II

Phase: Construction Documents

Previous Reviews: 3 August 2000 (Phase I, Construction Documents), 16 March 2000 (Phase I, Design Development), 28 October 1999 (Schematic)

Presenter: Charles Anderson, Charles Anderson Landscape Architecture

Attendees: Michael Shiosaki, Department of Parks and Recreation
Steven Wright, Department of Parks and Recreation
Allisona Greenberg, Charles Anderson Landscape Architecture

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00085)

Action: The Commission commends the design team and the Parks Department for the presentation and their efforts to build on the success of Phase I. The Commission would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Commission believes that the design for this urban ecological bog within Roxhill Park is very engaging;
- discussed the merits of the low fence at the perimeter of the bogs;
- appreciates the bridges as opportunities to allow visitors to cross and experience the bogs up close, further away from the activity of the park;
- is excited that the design does not reject its human-made nature and appreciates the experimental approach of this design;
- is concerned that the team did not better pursue artist involvement early on, and considers this a missed opportunity, noting that the gateposts were a community-designed element; and
- approves construction documents.

The design team updated the Commission on the growth of Phase I, and the design development of Phase II. Roxhill Park is located at 9244 29th Avenue Southwest, at the headwaters of Longfellow Creek. Phase I growth of the bog and wetlands have exceeded the design team's expectations. Phase II includes the construction of three additional bog cells.

The community would like a gathering space; an "anti-theater" will be constructed at the intersection of two pedestrian paths. The seating for this circular space will be provided by nicely set stones, rather than benches. A steel railing will provide an edge around the space, as the wetlands slope away from the anti-theater. The edge of the bog and wetland cells will be netted for one growing season, to keep balls, people, and wildlife from impacting the fragile first year growth of the new plantings. The hog wire panels of the fences would work well with the agricultural theme of the site. Currently, there are two bridges crossing the creek; two additional bridges will be constructed in Phase II. One bridge will cross the bog, at a lower level, to provide viewing opportunities between the visitors and the bog.

Fifty thousand plants will be planted in this phase, and the planting islands will be coordinated with matrices of different plantings, to identify appropriate plants for this area. Some sycamores will be removed for the bog and wetlands construction. An underground water detention system will also be incorporated in the construction of the informal turf surfaced playfield.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know if the hog wire panels would be required along the fences. Believes the fences

would be more interesting without these panels. Believes that a simple railing would be appropriate at the anti-theater.

- Proponents stated that there is a very active playfield near the site; the panels would keep soccer balls from falling into the bogs. Further stated that the low posts would be constructed of corten steel.
- Recognizes that this is an urban bog, and a well designed fence would complement this theme. Recognizes that the fence addresses functional concerns, but believes that visually, the fence should reinforce the design gesture of the bog and wetlands scheme.
 - Proponents stated that this is an entropic landscape, and nothing on the site is permanent. Further stated that the fence would be the only permanent structure on the site.
- Recognizes that the fence, for functional reasons, would ensure that people are kept out. Recognizes that a swale would be located uphill, and would like to know if this could provide a barrier to the soccer balls. Encourages that design team to locate the steel on the opposite side of the path.
- Believes that the tension between the human-made and natural elements is the best part of the design. Believes that the design of the fence should articulate this tension. Believes that a fence with corten steel posts and an invisible fence would be great.
- Encourages the design team to consider a fence on the uphill side of the path.
- Recognizes that the “anti-theater” is large, and the uphill and downhill sides of the “anti-theater” are very similar in scale. However, this is not typical of most theaters, and believes that they should be treated differently, and the seating should step down the hill.
- Feels that the fence should be higher. Believes that the fence should become a leaning rail.
- Urges the design team to engage the Seattle Arts Commission or an artist. Is concerned by the level of engagement at this stage.
- Would like the design team to explain the next steps of the project.
 - Proponents stated that they would rethink the edge around the bog and wetlands cells, but a rail is needed, to keep people out of the bogs.
- Believes that the entrances to the “anti-theater” should be spatially refined. Suggests that these entrances should be narrowed.
 - Proponents stated that service trucks would require clearance through this space.
- Does not object the design of the fences. Believes that the fences will make the bridges through the bogs more desirable.
- Commends the team for the innovative, creative project. Appreciates the integration of human-made and natural elements.

6 Jun 2002 Project: **Zymogenetics**
 Phase: Street Vacation
 Previous Review: 20 September 2001 (Pre-Petition)
 Presenters: Marty Goodman, The Justen Company
 Rich Haag, Rich Haag and Associates
 William Justen, The Justen Company
 Kay Kornovich, MBT Architects
 Attendees: Beverly Barnett, Seattle Transportation
 Michael Jenkins, Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use
 Anna O'Connell, University of Washington

Time: .75 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00247)

Action: **The Commission appreciates the update, including the clear presentation and informative reading of a complicated and fragmented set of existing conditions and issues. The Commission would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Commission appreciates the research and analysis of the potential public benefits package for the proposed vacation;**
- **recommends that the issue of transfer of areas within South Lake Union not be part of the discussion;**
- **recommends that the Eastlake Avenue/ Fairview Avenue reconfiguration not be a part of any proposed public benefits package;**
- **recommends that the public benefits be defined as the construction of a new sidewalk to Seattle Transportation standards from the Earl Davie building edge to the northern edge of the WSDOT property and an as yet to be determined additional public benefit; and**
- **supports the vacation of this unimproved, steeply sloped right of way, in principle, but requires a clearer definition of the proposed public benefits.**

ZymoGenetics, Inc., is currently located on Eastlake Avenue, in the historic City Light steam plant on Lake Union. ZymoGenetics converted these buildings to laboratory space in 1993, and an additional facility was built across Eastlake Avenue in 1998. ZymoGenetics currently hopes to expand their facilities to the north of the new building. An efficient expansion would require the vacation of an unimproved right-of-way, a portion of Bellevue Avenue East. ZymoGenetics controls the property to the south also; they may expand with a new building on this property. In addition to this building, they will lease two stories of office space in a nearby building. The proponents presented an update of ZymoGenetics' street vacation process. ZymoGenetics has now purchased the small triangular parcel that was owned by King County. The other adjacent property owner is Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). The proponents have examined the neighborhood plans for the area, and have worked with community members to determine what types of public amenities should be proposed.

The vacated portion of Bellevue Avenue East would allow the team to use the infrastructure that was built in Phase I, and build more efficient floor plates. Phase II construction would take advantage of the entry and loading areas that were built in Phase I, and the second research wing would extend to the north. Phase II construction would not affect the views in the neighborhood; the floor to floor heights would match that of the existing building. The new building would probably contain three floors of laboratories

and some office space. The architectural materials and details would be similar to those of the Phase I building, and the massing and elevation would be a mirrored version of the Phase I building.

The proponents met with the Eastlake Community Council Land Use Committee (ECCLUC) to determine an appropriate public benefit. ECCLUC agreed that off site mitigation would be appropriate, and suggested two different types of community improvements that would be appropriate opportunities and are priorities of the Eastlake Neighborhood Plan. First, ECCLUC would like ZymoGenetics to ensure that the City Light submerged parcels in front of the ZymoGenetics steam plant would remain open City property. The community would like to ensure that this open pristine environment is not used for boats. Second, ECCLUC believes that a redesign of the existing intersection where Fairview Avenue East turns to the southwest and becomes Fairview Avenue North is needed. The community would like to discourage drivers from making fast, sweeping turns, and ensure a safe pedestrian environment. Currently, there is an informal parking lot at this intersection. The community would like a formalized parking lot. Finally, the proponents also examined opportunities to improve Eastlake Avenue East street frontage along the WSDOT right of way, north of the site.

The proponents investigated the feasibility of the two options the ECCLUC presented. A portion of the land beneath the water is City Light property, and the Department of Natural Resources owns a portion. The departments do not have any plans for this land, but the appraised value of the land is high. To retain this as an open space, the Parks Department would have to buy the land from City Light.

The proponents presented a community-initiated drawing, from 1998, for pedestrian improvements within the Eastlake Avenue and Fairview Avenue. Multiple City departments examined these improvements when they were originally proposed, and the estimated costs were \$750,000. The project was placed on hold due to lack of funding.

The landscape architect on the design team presented some design schemes that would mitigate the intersection at Fairview Avenue. Through this scheme, Fairview Avenue would be a one-way street, starting at Garfield Street. Fairview Avenue would be twenty-six feet wide. The scheme also proposes a small park at the location of the current informal parking lot; the parking area would be replaced by a circle parking lot to the south west of the small park.

The proponents explained the proposed improvements to the right of way along the WSDOT property. The existing street trees along Eastlake Avenue would be continued along this edge. The team has also proposed to improve the sidewalk within the right of way to city standards, to improve the connection to the housing to the north.

The proponents also support the design solutions to the intersection of Fairview Avenue that have been proposed by the landscape architect and the community. However, these solutions would be very expensive, and the proponents would be able to contribute funds for these improvements, but full funding of these improvements would not be possible. The proponents explained that projects with private funding contributions are prioritized on Seattle Transportation's project lists.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Asks if ZymoGenetics may need to postpone expansion along with the postponement of their pilot plant. Would like to know if the proponents are still planning to expand.
 - Proponents stated that their decision to postpone the pilot plan project has accelerated the need for the Earl Davie Building expansion and the street vacation. Further stated that the expansion would focus on research and development space.
- Would like to know if Seattle Transportation has reviewed the changes to the Fairview Avenue

intersection yet.

- Proponents stated that they met with some Seattle Transportation staff, and they are familiar with this concept, and feel that the general concept for this intersection is appropriate. Further stated that this intersection does have traffic signals.
- Would like to know why the team has proposed a park at the triangular corner.
 - Proponents stated that this would be an improvement, but the some would also like to retain the existing parking.
- Supports the proposed public benefit at the intersection of Fairview Avenue and Eastlake Avenue. Believes that the design of this intersection must evolve. Recognizes that the proponents would make a contribution to forward these improvements. Does not believe that the proponents could be expected to improve the entire intersection alone. Believes that the contribution would be good, to accelerate these improvements. Does not know what dollar amount would be appropriate, and these details will not be known until the design is complete.
- Is concerned, believes that the proponents would need to define a public benefit, before the Commission could determine whether or not the benefit is appropriate, and approve the proposed vacation. Is concerned that the discussion is addressing *some* contribution to *some* design.
- Would like to know Seattle Transportation's opinion of the public benefit proposal.
 - A representative from Seattle Transportation stated that the proposed improvements to this intersection and the adjacent triangle are not part of anyone's work program. Does not feel that \$50,000 would be a significant amount for these improvements. Recognizes that a design has not been proposed, nor has a traffic analysis been completed. States that Seattle Transportation would not be able to commit to a project that is not yet defined, nor has it been presented to Seattle Transportation.
- Is very surprised that it would cost money to exchange land from one City department to another and believes that this idea should not be considered as a public benefit. Doesn't believe the proponents should consider improvements on the WSDOT land, as the land is steep and overgrown. Supports pedestrian improvements along Eastlake Avenue. Recognizes that the two projects ECCLUC proposed have put ZymoGenetics into an awkward position. Encourages the proponents to return to the community to identify a tangible project.
- Agrees, recognizes that the proponents do not have a cost estimate for these improvements. Suggests that the proponents could fund the design development of the public improvements, in order to establish the project on Seattle Transportation's list.
- Encourages the proponents to consider smaller improvements to two sides of the triangle, such as a sidewalk or other improvements to the edge.
- Asks Seattle Transportation if it would be appropriate for the proponents to contribute funding for a traffic study at this intersection as a public benefit.
 - A representative from Seattle Transportation stated that Seattle Transportation would not be able to commit to the proponents' project without a specific idea or plan for improvements. Seattle Transportation would have to first identify whether or not the project is feasible.
- Encourages the proponents to consider sidewalk improvements to Eastlake Avenue. Believes that the

feasibility of traffic improvements at this intersection should be considered before the proponents fund improvements. Believes that otherwise, the proponents would be pouring money down a hole. Believes that the proponents should still consider off-site improvements, such as the I-5 open space project. Does not believe that \$50,000 is enough.

- Proponents stated that many individuals in the community support or champion distinct projects, and the community does not necessarily agree on a single project. Further stated that these are two proposed benefits are items the community supports. The proponents would need to return to the community to identify a third option.
- Agrees, and recognizes that the public benefit would need to be a public benefit for the city as well as the Eastlake community.
- Encourages the team to reconsider the design of the expansion building to create a public space near the building, on the east side of Eastlake Avenue.
 - Proponents agreed, but stated that a public open space might be more appropriate across the street, closer to the lake, as there are more pedestrians on this side of the street.
- Does not believe that the Commission should designate a specific public benefit. Believes that the design team should identify the public benefit.
- Believes that the Commission could approve of streetscape improvements along Eastlake Avenue, and a contribution of \$50,000 to the Fairview Olmsted Park. Does not believe that the Commission can be prescriptive about the benefit. Recognizes that the proponents have already met with the community, to discuss possible improvements.
- Believes that if the proponents contribute funds, there should be a project identified to receive these funds. If not, it could be misinterpreted that the proponents have “bought” the vacation. Believes that the proponents should return to the community, to force the community to identify a tangible project. Believes that the improvements must be a public benefit, feasible and acceptable to the community. Believes that the proponents should return with a specific proposal, rather than a list of choices that may or may not be feasible.
- Is comfortable with the types of improvements the proponents have suggested, but does not believe that they are specific enough.
- Recognizes that the proponents have already been working with the community, and believes that it would be remiss for the Commission to delay this process.
- Believes that the Commission should direct the proponents to meet with the community to identify a contribution to a park, or identify an opportunity for improvements to pedestrian connections across Fairview Avenue. Suggests that the proponents could also meet with the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks Department), or Seattle Transportation to identify a public benefit.
 - A representative from Seattle Transportation stated that typically, the proponents are required to identify an appropriate benefit, whether or not the benefit is on-site or off-site.
- Agrees, but does not believe that it will be resolved, if the proponents meet with the community again. Encourages the proponents to meet with the Parks Department.
 - A representative from Seattle Transportation agreed, and stated that the proponents could also meet with Seattle Transportation, but the proponents must identify a specific benefit.
 - Proponents agreed and stated that the Parks Department has some street end projects on

board, within the community.

- Agrees, and feels that the project should be agreed upon by the community and the city.
 - Proponents agreed and stated that they could also contribute to another project that is under development.